

LC



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/235,531	01/22/1999	KARIN BIEBER	476	4591

7590 03/06/2002

STRIKER STRIKER & STENBY
103 EAST NECK ROAD
HUNTINGTON, NY 11743

EXAMINER

CADUGAN, ERICA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3722

18

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/235,531

Applicant(s)

BIEBER ET AL.

Examiner

Erica E Cadugan

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 20 December 2001 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Faxing of Responses to Office Actions

1. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703) 872-9302 or, for responses after final rejection only, to (703) 872-9303. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Drawings

2. Regarding the proposed drawing change filed 12/20/2001, there is no new matter introduced by merely adding reference element numbers, and as for the “striking impulses”, as the specification as originally filed did teach that element 28 is an “impact mechanism” used for “delivering axial impacts against the drilling spindle 13” (page 9, lines 4-6), there is no new matter introduced by this proposed change. However, via the entry of the approved drawing amendment, the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 28a and 28b. Thus the proposed drawing amendment is not approved. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, would be required if Applicant wanted to make this drawing change. (It is noted that Applicant stated that appropriate correction would be made to the specification in the response of 12/20/2001. It is also noted that the specification as originally filed would support calling these

Art Unit: 3722

elements 28a and 28b “first” and “second” parts of the “impact mechanism”, but would not support the level of detail about these items and their function set forth on page 4 of the response filed 12/20/2001).

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text. Additionally, Applicant is reminded of the manner of making amendments as required by 37 CFR 1.121, which requires both a clean and a marked-up copy of the text being amended, wherein the marked-up copy is illustrative of changes made. In the instant case, Applicant did not provide a marked-up copy of the amended abstract.

Response to Amendment

4. The amendment filed December 20, 2001 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: in the new abstract, lines 2-3, Applicant has added the following language: “a drive motor for rotatably and strikingly through a striking mechanism driving the drilling spindle”. As previously described in the office action mailed September 20, 2001, the specification as originally filed did not provide that the motor both rotated and “strikingly drove” the spindle. As set forth in the disclosure as originally filed, the only teaching provided about the specific percussion mechanism is found on page 9, lines 3-8. Therefore, the specification as originally filed did not provide a teaching that the motor 11 that rotatably drives the spindle 13 (see page 8, lines 2-12) also “strikingly” drives the spindle 13.

Art Unit: 3722

Note that the specification does provide that an "impact mechanism 28" is used "for delivering axial impacts against the drilling spindle 13" (page 9, lines 4-6), and thus the specification as originally filed would support a description of a motor that rotatably drives the spindle and an "impact mechanism" that strikingly drives the spindle.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, claims 1 and 8 set forth that the drive motor is "for rotatably and strikingly driving said drilling spindle". However, as set forth in the disclosure as originally filed and described above, the only teaching provided about the specific percussion mechanism is found on page 9, lines 3-8. The specification does not provide a teaching that the motor 11 that rotatably drives the spindle 13 (see page 8, lines 2-12) also "strikingly" drives the spindle 13. Note that the specification does provide that an "impact mechanism 28" is used "for delivering axial impacts against the drilling spindle 13" (page 9, lines 4-6), and thus the specification as originally filed would support a claim limitation directed to an "impact mechanism". Examiner suggests changing "a drive motor for rotatably and strikingly driving through a striking mechanism driving said drilling spindle" to language such as –a drive motor for rotatably driving

Art Unit: 3722

said drilling spindle; an impact mechanism for strikingly driving said drilling spindle--. It is noted that applicant has submitted a proposed drawing amendment indicating elements 28a and 28b and "striking impulses" to overcome the previous 112, first paragraph rejection. However, as the specification as originally filed still did not provide any teaching that the motor was used to both rotate and strikingly drive the spindle, this proposed drawing amendment does not serve to so overcome the 112, 1st paragraph rejection.

7. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1 and 8, it is unclear what is meant by the limitation "and is uncoupled from strikes of said drilling spindle". Firstly, a strike is not an object, and it is thus unclear how a non-object is "uncoupled" as claimed. Secondly, it is unclear as claimed whether the arresting device operates to uncouple some (unclaimed) striker from the spindle 13, or whether the arresting device is merely being set forth as a separate entity than some (again, unclaimed) striker (arresting device is "uncoupled"). As set forth in the response submitted 12/20/2001, it appears as though applicant is stating that this limitation is supposed to indicate that the arresting device is offset from the impact mechanism. Examiner suggests amending the claim to reflect this to overcome this rejection, e.g., assuming that Applicant adopts Examiner's previous suggestion to overcome the 112, 1st paragraph rejection, replace "and is uncoupled from strikes of said drilling spindle so that it is not subjected to the strikes" with language similar to --and wherein said arresting device is positioned such that it is not subject to strikes of the impact mechanism--.

fixed in claim 1, not in claim 8 Page 6

There are several positively recited limitations that lack sufficient antecedent bases in the claims. Examples of these are: “the torque transmission” in claim 1, line 15 and claim 8, lines 15-16 (note that the claimed “the torque transmission” is not the same torque transmission as the one previously set forth in the claim as the previous one was a transmission from the drive motor, and the indicated one is a transmission from the tool holder, Examiner suggests changing “the torque transmission” to –a torque transmission--).

In each of the independent claims 1, 8, and 16, it is unclear in the limitation “an intermediate shaft non-rotatably connected with said drilling spindle” what is meant by “non-rotatably”, as the specification seems to indicate that the intermediate shaft 17 rotatably supports a gear 16 thereon (Figure 2 and page 8, lines 8-10), and that the intermediate shaft 17 also has teeth 18, 19 thereon for engagement with gears 20, 21 on the shaft of drilling spindle 13 (page 8, lines 10-12). In order for the shaft of motor 11 to ultimately drive the spindle 13, it appears that shaft 17 must rotatably connect to spindle 13 via the teeth 18, 19, and the gears 20, 21. Note that the specification does teach that when switching between transmission stages, the gears 20 and 21 are non-rotatably connected with spindle 13, but that these claims set forth that the tool receives a torque from the drive motor which can't occur if the intermediate shaft 17 and spindle 13 are non-rotatably connected as claimed. Note that the response submitted 12/20/2001, Applicant changed a different instance of the word “non-rotatably” to “rotatably” than the one described in this paragraph. Examiner suggests changing the instances of “non-rotatably” that Applicant changed in claims 1 and 8 in the response submitted 12/20/2001 to “rotatably” back to “non-rotatably” and changing the instances indicated in this paragraph to –rotatably--, and also changing the indicated instance in claim 16 to –rotatably--.

As set forth in amended claims 1 and 8, last line, it is unclear what is meant by "it". ✓

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-16, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,433,082 (Bitter et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,788,021 (Tsai). Bitter et al. teaches a hammer-drill (see title of invention) which has a motor housing 13 and a gear case 15 (column 3, lines 32-35 and Figures 1-2). The motor housing houses a motor (column 3, lines 35-36) which ultimately drives a tool chuck 19 threadedly connected to a forward end of spindle shaft 43 (Figure 2 and column 4, lines 12-15). Thus, the spindle shaft 43 inherently receives a moment during exchanging of the tool chuck. A "stage" of gears 35, 37, 39, 41 is provided between the motor shaft 25 (which constitutes an "intermediate shaft", see Figure 2 and column 3, lines 51-67) and the spindle shaft 43. Specifically regarding claims 4 and 11, while Bitter et al. does not specifically describe the transmission ratio, note that the input gears 35, 37, 39 are smaller in diameter (Figure 2) than the output gear 41, and thus the output speed is slower than the input speed. Note that the motor or "intermediate" shaft 25 is radially offset from the spindle shaft 43 (Figure 2). Any number of elements taught by Bitter et al. could constitute a "component connected to said machine housing". For example, as viewed in Figure 2, screws 17 are connected to the housing. Bitter et al. does not teach an arresting device. Tsai teaches an automatic output shaft locking mechanism for an electric tool such as a drill or a striking tool (column 1, lines 7-23). Tsai's device utilizes a retaining ring 50, which constitutes a "disc". The "disc" 50 has a plurality of radial projections 502 (Figure 2), which project outwardly from center hole 501 (see Figure 1). The center hole 501 constitutes a bearing seat which couples disc 50 to shaft 60. Tsai also teaches the use of a "claw coupling" 20 which

Art Unit: 3722

has a plurality of axially extending claws 203 (see Figure 1). Tsai teaches that a motor output shaft is divided into an inner shaft 10 and an outer shaft 60 (column 2, lines 35-38 and Figure 1). When a torque is applied to the inner or intermediate shaft 10 (e.g., via the motor), the outer or output shaft 60 rotates (column 3, lines 28-35, and Figures 3 and 4). When a torque is applied to the output shaft 60 (e.g., manually), the disc 50 is locked in position (column 3, lines 35-60 and Figures 5 and 6) such that a chuck or a drill bit can be speedily and conveniently replaced (column 3, lines 60-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the automatic output shaft locking mechanism taught by Tsai to the drill taught by Bitter et al. (such that the divided shaft taught by Tsai replaces the shaft portion of motor shaft 25 taught by Bitter et al., and wherein the inner shaft 10 taught by Tsai would be connected to the motor taught by Bitter et al. and the outer shaft 60 taught by Tsai would be to the left side of the replaced shaft as viewed in Figure 2 of Bitter et al., thus positioning the locking mechanism at an "end side" of a toothed gear 35 of the stage taught by Bitter et al.), for the purpose of allowing drill bits to be speedily and conveniently removed or replaced (Tsai, column 3, lines 60-64).

9. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,433,082 (Bitter et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,788,021 (Tsai) as applied to claims 1, 5, 8, 10, and 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,030,818 (Zagar). Bitter et al. in view of Tsai teaches all aspects of the invention as claimed in claims 6 and 13 as set forth in the above 103 rejection based thereon, but does not teach that the shaft 25 has a non-cylindrical cross section. Zagar teaches the use of a gear 21, which is a driven disc. The gear 21 is mounted on a polygonal portion of a shaft 27 (Figures 1 and 3). The polygonally-mounted

Art Unit: 3722

portion acts as a key coupling (column 1, lines 18-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a polygonal shaft as taught by Zagar for the motor shaft taught by Bitter et al. in view of Tsai such that the portion of the shaft that held the disc was polygonally-shaped for the purpose of providing a built-in key between the disc and the shaft, thus preventing slippage between the disc and the shaft.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed December 20, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections under 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd paragraph have been addressed above.

12. Regarding the Tsai reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,788,021), Applicant has asserted that the Tsai reference teaches that the arresting device is "arranged in the chain of components through which striking impulses are transmitted" (pp. 5 and 7 of response submitted 12/20/2001).

However, it is noted that Tsai is silent about the location of the striking device in general, and particularly is silent as to the arrangement of such striking device with respect to the arresting device. Tsai merely teaches that the present invention may be applied to output shafts of "drill drives and impact drills" (col. 1, lines 19-20, for example). Additionally, it is noted that no such language is found in the claims, and particularly with regard to claims 15-16, which do not even specify that the drill has to be a "percussion drilling machine" as this is an alternative limitation, and which definitely do not provide any structure of any impacting mechanism relative to the arresting device. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations

Art Unit: 3722

from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

13. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, (i.e., Applicant's assertions that U.S. Pat. No. 3,433,082 (Bitter et al.) does not teach an arresting device) one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It is noted that Bitter et al. was not relied upon to teach this feature in the rejections of the present claims based upon the combination of Bitter et al. with other references.

14. Applicant appears to be asserting that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to replace the motor output shaft taught by Bitter with the subdivided output shaft taught by Tsai (p. 8 of the response filed 12/20/2001) because Tsai's shaft is subdivided. However, it is irrelevant to the invention as set forth in the present claims whether or not this shaft is subdivided, and as described in the above rejection, Tsai provides motivation for doing so (for the purpose of allowing drill bits to be speedily and conveniently removed or replaced, Tsai, column 3, lines 60-64). As previously stated, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant has additionally stated that Bitter doesn't provide a motivation or "suggestion" to provide Bitter's device with an arresting device. Again, it is noted that Tsai, not Bitter was relied upon to teach this motivation.

Applicant has asserted that:

"[I]f a person skilled in the art starting from the teaching of the patent to Bitter uses the teaching of the patent to Tsai for the solution of the patent to Bitter, he will not arrive at

the applicant's invention, but instead would just subdivide the output shaft 43 of the solution disclosed in the patent to Bitter into the inner shaft and the outer shaft."

This is not persuasive. Applicant's attention is directed to the above rejection which states:

"Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the automatic output shaft locking mechanism taught by Tsai to the drill taught by Bitter et al. (such that the divided shaft taught by Tsai replaces the shaft portion of motor shaft 25 taught by Bitter et al., and wherein the inner shaft 10 taught by Tsai would be connected to the motor taught by Bitter et al. and the outer shaft 60 taught by Tsai would be to the left side of the replaced shaft as viewed in Figure 2 of Bitter et al., thus positioning the locking mechanism at an "end side" of a toothed gear 35 of the stage taught by Bitter et al.), for the purpose of allowing drill bits to be speedily and conveniently removed or replaced (Tsai, column 3, lines 60-64)."

Note that the shaft 43 asserted by Applicant is not the shaft being replaced by Tsai's shaft. The motor output shaft 25 taught by Bitter is the output shaft being replaced by the shaft described by Applicant as Tsai's "subdivided" output shaft.

Additionally, it appears via Applicant's remarks about the special construction of the striking mechanism taught by Bitter (pp. 7-8 of applicant's response filed 12/20/2001) that Applicant is asserting that Bitter teaches away from the present invention. However, it is unclear what teachings about Bitter's striking mechanism have to do with the modification to the motor output shaft 25 of Bitter. Note that nothing about Bitter's striking mechanism is being modified (see the above art rejection), and also note that there does not appear to be any reason that adding the arresting device taught by Tsai to Bitter's device in the manner described in the above art rejection would preclude Bitter's striking device from acting in the manner in which it was intended.

With regard to the limitation in the last lines of independent claims 1 and 8 (note that no such limitations are found in the independent claims 15 and 16) regarding the arresting device

Art Unit: 3722

being “uncoupled from strikes of said drilling spindle so that it is not subjected to the strikes”, note that when Bitter’s device is in hammer-drill mode, shaft 43 moves axially while supported by bearings 49 and 51, while the motor shaft 25 does not and the motor shaft 25 is offset from this shaft, and thus the motor shaft 25 (and thus the arresting device taught by Tsai) are not “subjected to strikes” (see Bitter, col. 3, line 51 through col. 4, line 12 and Figure 2). It is additionally noted that as described by Bitter, the drill can be switched to function as a drill rather than a hammer-drill (col. 5, lines 65-69, for example), and thus no shaft of Bitter’s device is subject to “strikes” when the drill operates in the drill mode. Thus, the combination of Bitter and Tsai provides a percussion drill with an arresting device that is “located outside of a chain of components through which striking impulses are transmitted” (note that this language is not found in any claim, but this is what Applicant is asserting that the described limitation means on page 5 of Applicant’s response filed 12/20/2001).

Applicant has asserted that “[t]he same arguments are believed to be applicable to the patent to Zagar”. Likewise, the responses to those arguments outlined above equally apply.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 3722

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erica E Cadugan whose telephone number is (703) 308-6395. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea L. Wellington can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

eec

eec

February 27, 2002

A. L. Wellington
A. L. WELLINGTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Attachment for PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier)

6/18/01

The below text replaces the pre-printed text under the heading, "Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes," on the back of the PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier) form.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

1. Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85

New corrected drawings must be filed with the changes incorporated therein. Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin. If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the Notice of Allowability. Extensions of time may **NOT** be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability. The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

2. Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit the drawing corrections within the time period set in the attached Office communication. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.